

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In accordance with the restriction requirement stated in the Office Action dated December 24, 2004, Applicant hereby elects Group I.

Claims 13-32 have been canceled in accordance with the restriction requirement and the election of Group I. Claims 33-38 have been added. Claims 1-12 and 33-38 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections 102(e) – Groath

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Groath et al. (USPN 6,571,285) (hereinafter “Groath”).

Claim 1 recites:

An event management system comprising:
an email consumer configured to handle email messages;
a paging consumer configured to generate a page message;
an active scripting consumer configured to execute at least one script;
a log file consumer configured to record information in a log file;
an event log consumer configured to log messages to an event log;
and
a command line consumer configured to launch at least one process.

Thus, the event management system recited in Claim 1 includes six distinct event consumers where each event consumer is configured to perform a particular action.

Groath describes a technique for providing an integrated service assurance environment for a network. In particular, Groath discloses performing a notification action based upon the occurrence of an event where “the notification

action may include an alphanumeric page, an e-mail message, a resolution script, remedy trouble ticket, and/or a log message.” (Groath, col. 10, lines 53-63; Fig. 3). While Groath’s technique may perform some actions related to event handling, Groath fails to disclose any of the event consumers recited in Claim 1.

Groath also fails to disclose the actions performed by the command line consumer. In particular, Claim 1 recites “a command line consumer configured to launch at least one process”. The Office Action rejects this element of Claim 1 by citing Groath at col. 19, lines 19-22, which states:

If the data files are remote and the platform is NT, the remote shell command will be used to run a script that will reside on the remote machine.

This citation does not disclose an event consumer. Further, the citation does not disclose the action performed by the command line consumer, which includes launching a process, not merely running a script. Therefore, Applicant submits that the cited portion of Groath fails to disclose “a command line consumer configured to launch at least one process” as claimed in Claim 1.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Groath and is allowable. Given that Claims 2-12 depend from Claim 1, Claims 2-12 are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim Rejections 103(a) – Groath and Murray

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Groath in view of Murray (Windows NT Event Logging by James D. Murray,

published on September 1998). Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 3 is patentable over Groath and Murray.

Claim 3 depends from Claim 1 and recites:

An event management system as recited in claim 1 wherein the event log consumer is an NT event log consumer.

As discussed above, Groath does not disclose any of the event consumers recited in Claim 1. Further, Groath does not disclose the action performed by the command line consumer. Murray does not remedy these deficiencies.

The Office Action admits that Groath fails to disclose an NT event log consumer. The Office Action asserts that Murray discloses in Chapter 2 that "Microsoft API's are available to interface with NT event log service". However, even assuming that the assertion is true, this teaching merely describes a feature of the NT event log service, not a separate event consumer that interacts with the log service. Thus, Murray still fails to disclose an NT event log consumer as recited in Claim 3.

For at least these additional reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 3 is patentable over Groath and Murray.

New Claims

New Claims 33-38 are added herein. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 33-38 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

Claims 1-12 and 33-38 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 3/24/04

By: Thomas Wong Reg. No. 38,540
for Thomas Wong
Reg. No. 48,577
(206) 315- 4001 X106